

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4-8 and 10-20 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

As noted in the Response dated March 10, 2008, a Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review was filed in this application on September 21, 2007. The Notice of Panel Decision resulting from that Review indicated that the previous rejection was withdrawn, and that a new Office Action would be issued. As further noted in said response, in the Office Actions issued on December 11, 2007 and June 12, 2008, the Examiner reasserted the rejections of claims 1, 4-8, 10-13 and 20 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,452,004 to Roberts, (hereinafter, "Roberts"); claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,827,348 to Ernest et al. (hereinafter, "Ernest"); and claims 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts in view of Ernest and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,382,974 to Soeda et al. (hereinafter, "Soeda"). The Applicant hereby traverses the rejections, as follows.

In the response dated March 10, 2008, the Applicant submitted that Roberts does not disclose "a plurality of reset signal lines disposed along the row direction, each being associated with one pixel row for supplying a reset signal." See, the response dated March 10, 2008, at the first paragraph of page 3.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserts that column 8, lines 44-55 and column 7, lines 11-26 show that the sensor of Roberts includes reset signal lines.

However, as shown in FIG. 2 thereof, Roberts discloses only NOR gates 64, each connected with a row signal line 58 and a column signal line 56. The NOR gate 64 can supply an output in response to a combination of the row signal line and the column signal line. In Roberts, only when both signal lines 58 and 56 are LOW, the NOR gate 64 turns on the transistor 70 to reset the capacitor 44. Thus, the row signal line 58 of Roberts does not constitute a reset signal line.

In the claimed invention, the reset signal line, which supplies the reset signal, is disposed in a row direction. As explained above, the row signal line 58 of Roberts does not constitute a reset signal line. Moreover, as also explained above, to reset the capacitor 44 in Roberts, a particular combination of outputs provided by both the row and column signal lines 58 and 56 is required. Thus, Roberts does not disclose or suggest at least the features of a plurality of reset signal lines disposed along the row direction, each being associated with one pixel row for supplying a reset signal, as recited in independent claims 1 and 14.

It is noted that Ernest does not cure the deficiencies of Roberts noted above. Moreover, Soeda is not cited for and does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of Roberts and Ernest.

For all of the above reasons, the Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 14 are allowable over Roberts. As claims 1 and 14 are allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 4-8 and 10-13, and claims 15-19, which depend from allowable claims 1 and 14, respectively, are likewise allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 14.

The Applicant further submits that claim 20 is similarly allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4-8 and 10-20 are in condition for allowance and the issuance of a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing docket number **107317-00026**.

Respectfully submitted,



Michele L. Connell  
Registration No. 52,763

**Customer No. 004372**

ARENT FOX LLP  
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Telephone No. (202) 857-6104  
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395

CMM/MLC: